MINUTES OF MEETING OF COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 18,1926.

The fifth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1926 was held in its office in the Interior Department Building, on Thursday, February 18, 1926.

The following members were present:

Mr. Moore, Chairman,
Mr. Greenleaf,
Mr. Mowbray,
Mr. Medary,
Mr. Delano,
Mr. Garfield,
also Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and Executive Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The minutes of the meeting held January 7, 1926, were approved.

2. FISCAL MATTERS PERTAINING TO THE COMMISSION: The secretary reported that upon the recommendation of the President and the Director of the Budget the Senate Appropriations Committee had approved a Deficiency Item of $1400 for expenses of the Commission to provide for the meetings of the Commission during the remainder of this fiscal year, and that the Senate had adopted the item on February 17, 1926, as an amendment to the First Deficiency Act. Also, that Mr. Wood, Chairman of the subcommittee on the Executive and Independent Offices Appropriation Bill, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1926, had reported the item pertaining to the Commission of Fine Arts identically as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, reading as follows:

> "For expenses made necessary by the Act entitled 'An Act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts,' approved May 17, 1910, including the purchase of periodicals, maps and books of reference, and payment of actual traveling expenses of the members and secretary of the commission in attending meetings of the commission either

within or outside of the District of Columbia, to be disbursed on vouchers approved by the commission, $5,000, of which amount not to exceed $3,300 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

For all printing and binding for the Commission of Fine Arts, $295.

The secretary further stated that the Personnel Classification Board had increased the classification of the secretary to the Commission from Grade C.A.F.7 to C.A.F.8, and that in accordance with a provision of the Classification Act the Chairman of the Commission had increased the salary of the secretary to $3,000 a year. This was approved by the Commission. (Exhibit 1).

3. NATIONAL GUARD ARMORY: Under date of January 22, 1926, Hon. R. N. Elliott, Chairman of the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, referred for the views of the Commission Bill H.R.8121, "To provide for the erection of a National Guard Armory in the District of Columbia as a memorial to those who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during times of war".

In view of the suggestion heretofore made that the Pension Office be made available for the District of Columbia militia, the matter was taken up with Major General Anton Stephan, Commanding the District of Columbia Militia, who expressed himself heartily in favor of this suggestion. The Commission felt that the Pension Office is well adapted to the needs of the District Militia and other patriotic organizations. The Commission thought that the memorial feature suggested in the Bill was covered by the District of Columbia World War Memorial, authorized by the Act approved June 7, 1924.

Attention was called to the fact that plans for an Armory had been prepared several years ago and a site for it designated in the publid buildings program on the square along Pennsylvania Avenue, between Twelfth and Thirteenth Streets. By using the Pension Office building for an Armory, one of the

proposed new public buildings, such as a building for the Internal Revenue office or the General Accounting office, could be built on that site. A report was made to Representative Elliott (Exhibit B).

The secretary stated that the pending Public Buildings Bill for $165,000,000 had passed the House of Representatives on February 15, 1926, of which amount $50,000,000 is authorized to be spent on public buildings in the District of Columbia on the basis of $10,000,000 a year for a period of five years.

4. MARKER FOR CEMETERIES OF THE UNITED STATES: By letter of January 25, 1926, Hon. Frank W. Reid, House of Representatives, requested the advice of the Commission as to a suggested design for a monument in cemeteries of the United States, as follows:

> "One of my constituents has sent me the enclosed drawing of a monument which he says is to be erected in every cemetery of the United States. He states that the names of the soldiers buried in the cemetery are to be engraved on the plate, thus making it easier to locate the graves of the soldiers buried there.
>
> "He would like the opinion of your Commission on this monument, and I would appreciate it if you would let me hear from you regarding it, returning the drawing with your letter."

The Commission inspected the design. A monument of this design the Commission did not think appropriate for cemeteries of the United States and the Commission therefore disapproved the design. (Exhibit C).

5. WASHINGTON WATERFRONT PLANS: Major James A. O'Conner, District Engineer Officer in charge of Washington work, accompanied by Mr. E. A. Schmitt, Mr. N. B. Hodskin, and P. C. Dore, of that office; also Major Cary H. Brown, Assistant Director of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks, and Mr. James G. Landon, Landscape Architect of the National Capital Park Commission, submitted preliminary plans for the development of the water front of the Washington Channel along Water Street, which were prepared in accordance with a provision of the Rivers and Harbors Act, approved March 3, 1925 (Public No.585,

68th Congress), as follows:

> "Potomac River: The water front on the north side of the Washington Channel, District of Columbia, with the view of surveying same and preparing and submitting plans and estimates of cost for the construction of an adequate terminal or terminals which would provide appropriate facilities for water transportation and for interchange of traffic between vessels and the railroads and highways, respectively, including any recommendations which may be deemed advisable for coordinating the full commercial use of said water front and the approaches, with the beautification thereof."

Major O'Conner stated that plans for the development of the waterfront along Water Street, were prepared several years ago in connection with the plan for East Potomac Park, but nothing was ever done as to the development of Water Street. These preliminary plans he said are based to a certain extent on that Plan,and in the preparation of them views of commercial waterfronts of great European cities, belonging to the Commission of Fine Arts, were consulted.

Major O'Conner said that in the preparation of the plans careful consideration was given by his office to the future requirements of this waterfront for commercial purposes. It was his opinion that Washington is too far from ocean navigation to require the construction of great docks, warehouses and railroad facilities along the Washington waterfront. Baltimore, he said, is the great port for this locality, and railroads can easily take care of the bulk of traffic between that city and Washington.

Major O'Conner called attention to the amount of water traffic up the Potomac to Georgetown, which at the present time, he said, consists mostly of barges, now and then a sailing boat, and an oil steamer supplying the Georgetown Gas Light Company which makes 30 or 40 trips a year. He regarded the hydro-electric power of the Potomac River of great value, better than that of the Susquehanna River. The Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company, he said, has rights going back to the year 1783, and in the acquirement of land by the Government

along the shores of the Potomac he thought that the Canal Company will undoubtedly assert such rights.

The waterfront plans submitted contemplate the transformation of the waterfront from Fourteenth treet, at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, to the Washington Barracks, into a symmetrical line of docks, the paving of Water Street, with suitable provision for trees and park areas. One of these small park areas will be at the intersection of Seventh Street, L and M Streets, where there will be a connecting driveway (very probably along L Street) towards the Navy Yard to the Anacostia Park. There will be additional park areas at 10th and H Streets, and between 13th and 13th½ Streets, S.W. At the south end of Water Street will be a large semi-circular recreation pier. The Municipal Fish Market, at the foot of 12th Street, the design for which was approved by this Commission a few years ago, will remain and will suggest the type of buildings that should be constructed along Water Street. Space has been provided on the plans for the many activities that now center on the waterfront,-piers for the Washington and Norfolk steamers, excursion steamers, sailing and fishing boats, produce boats, and landing places for launches and canoes, fire and police boats. At the north end of the Washington Channel the plans suggest a short bridge to connect East Potomac Park with Water Street. This the Commission regard necessary to provide a direct connection between East Potomac Park and Water Street, South Washington and the Anacostia Park. A small, inexpensive bridge, was thought ample.

It was felt that the construction of additional piers along Water Street would cause rapid accumulation of trash at the piers, but Mr. Schmitt said these piers will be built on piles and there will be a constant flow of water under them. Major O'Conner stated that his office regarded the present size

of the Tidal Basin necessary to flush the Washington Channel, at tides. This amounts to 111 acres of water 3 feet deep. Mr. Medary said he regarded the flushing of the Washington Channel by the Tidal Basin an engineering problem which could be accomplished in another way.

As to the treatment of Water Street itself, Mr. Schmitt said that Water Street is 80 feet wide between curbs. The existing sheds along Water Street will be removed and the street is to be paved. At the present time there are four street car tracks on Water Street. The Commission thought two car tracks should be sufficient and that these should be placed in the middle of parking space in the center of Water Street, possibly 15 feet wide, with driveways from 30 to 40 feet wide on each side of it.

On the whole the Commission felt that the development of Water Street and the waterfront should harmonize with the East Potomac Park development, which is the great recreational park of the city. The Commission advised, and Major O'Conner concurred in this, that in time the commerce of the city should be diverted to the Anacostia River, where railroad facilities exist now, and where commercial wharves and large warehouses may well be constructed in the future; thus making it possible for the National Capital to have a clean shore line along the Washington Channel, which is the "water gate" to the city.

The Commission approved the tentative plans submitted. This was gratifying to Major O'Conner, who said he would have the final plan for the waterfront embody the important features of these tentative plans and include the suggestions made by the Commission. The plan will then be submitted to Congress. Major O'Conner said when the plan is adopted by Congress work can be begun on it with an appropriation of $10,000 or $50,000. (Exhibit D)

6. PLANS FOR THE ARMY MEDICAL CENTER: Surgeon General Ireland of the Army

and Major General B. F. Cheatham, The Quartermaster General, submitted plans for the construction of a number of additional buildings at the Army Medical Center (Walter Reed Hospital), Congress having authorized extensions amounting to $3,000,000. In company with General Ireland were Col. F. B. Wheaton, Col. H. L. Casey, and Major George G. Will, of the Quartermaster General's office.

The plans provided for several buildings,-a Red Cross House, wards, kitchen, and dining room. They are to take the place of a number of existing temporary buildings, and involve an expenditure of $1,250,000.

The ground plan was inspected, showing the lay-out of the buildings. Mr. Medary took exception to building wards in a row as proposed, saying it is an obsolete way to build a hospital. Mr. Medary suggested that the plans be submitted to a skilled surgeon for examination as to hospital requirements. The Army officials said they had discussed this question but the wards were arranged in the manner indicated because of the peculiar shape of the grounds, and that the plans submitted suggested the best way in which these buildings could be built.

The architect members thereupon inspected the plans, and upon their recommendation the Commission approved them, with the suggestion that a study be made of the eliptical arches (Exhibit E).

Mr. Moore inquired as to what they proposed doing with Fourteenth Street, and General Ireland said that the plan provides for the extension of Fourteenth Street through the grounds, but that busses and motor vehicles would be required to go around the grounds.

7. UNIFORM FLAG DISPLAY, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: In accordance with arrangements made, the Commission inspected flagstaffs on F Street, between Twelfth and Thirteenth Street, at 2 o'clock in the afternoon. Captain Julius I. Peyser and Mr. Frank L. Peckham, representing the American Legion, were present. Thirty

flagstaffs, 25 feet apart, had been erected, 15 on each side of the street, on which flags, 3 x 5 feet in size, had been hoisted.

The Commission regarded the flagstaffs too willowy and too low, so that the flags would be apt to interfere with traffic; also the flags were regarded too small.

The Commission recommended that the flagstaffs be lengthened and stiffened, and that the flags be made somewhat larger. (Exhibit F).

8. UNITED STATES FLAG STANDARDIZATION: Mr. Mowbray called attention to the letter received from the Navy Department dated February 6, 1926 (Exhibit G), in which this statement is made,---

> "It will be noted that while the hoists of the flags listed above are in even feet, the length of the fly under the adopted modular standard will not be in even feet."

Mr. Mowbray said that the ratio of 13 to 21 under the modular standard of measurement is constant, and that under this new standard of measurement the size of flags should be spoken of in terms of the hoist. Mr. Mowbray advised that he had been in communication with officials of the Navy Yard at Brooklyn, who are making preparation for 30 and 60 day tests.

9. JANE A. DELANO MEMORIAL: The secretary read a letter received from Mrs. Mary Logan Tucker, President, National Society Dames of the Loyal Legion, 1836 Connecticut Avenue, of this city, protesting against the erection of a memorial to Jane A. Delano in front of the Red Cross Building, as follows:

> "I notice in the Press, a plan approved by your Commission for a statue to be placed in front of the Red Cross Building as a memorial to Miss Jane Delano. As National President of the Dames of the Loyal Legion, I desire to protest against such action on your part. The only statue or memorial which should ever be placed in front of the Red Cross Building, is a statue of Clara Barton, who brought the Red Cross to the United States. You will notice no

doubt, the inscription of the building reads, "To the Memory of the Loyal Women of the Civil War", which I think would certainly make it inappropriate to have Miss Delano's statue in front of the building. Her work was great and I trust a memorial will be erected to her memory for the work which she did in the world war, and the organization of the great corps of nurses of which every one should be proud.

"May you find it possible to place the statue at some other point near the Red Cross Building, or in the building, but I sincerely hope that in the near future a suitable memorial to Clara Barton will be placed in front of the Red Cross Building in honor of the great work which she did for humanity, not only during the Civil War, but on many fields of disaster in our country and in Europe, recognized by all European governments, in whose countries she was called to labor, by the medals given her and the tributes paid her.

"Assuring you of my sympathy in the movement for a memorial to Miss Delano, of some kind, I remain,

Very sincerely,

Mary Logan Tucker".

The Commission decided that as they had submitted a report in the matter of location of the Jane A. Delano memorial, no action need be taken with regard to this protest.

10. GAILLARD MEMORIAL TABLET: On February 16, 1926, Mr. John J. Earley, Architectural Sculptor, of this city, submitted a sketch for a tablet to Lieut. Col. du B. Gaillard, to be erected at the Gaillard Cut in the Panama Canal Zone. Mr. Earley submitted with the sketch a communication setting forth that it was proposed to have the tablet be 30' x 15' in size, but that he would recommend 20' x 12'. The tablet is to be of concrete of the exposed aggregate type,-red jasperite for the background and green ceramic for the letters. The inscription proposed consisted simply of the following, "Gaillard, 1859-1913". The tablet is to be 100 feet above water and 200 feet from the center line of the Canal.

Mr. Delano made a scale drawing, simplifying the sketch, which the Commission approved. The Commission recommended that the tablet be erected vertically (Exhibit H).

11. COOLIDGE DAM, GILA RIVER, ARIZONA: Major C. R. Olberg of the Indian

Office, Department of the Interior, appeared before the Commission and requested advice as to securing an architect for the Coolidge Dam, which is being erected San Carlos Indian project, in Arizona across the Gila River, about 75 miles from the Roosevelt Dam. It is a great project, involving an expenditure of $5,000,000 and Major Olberg felt that while the project is primarily an engineering one the service of an architect is necessary to design gate houses, railing and the like. The problem he said is how to secure an architect for this work, since the Comptroller General has recently ruled that under the Classification Act no one can be paid in excess of $7,500 a year, which amounts to about $20.60 a day, whereas an architect could do this work in possibly three months but would be entitled to more than $20 a day.

Mr. Medary called attention to Rule 10 of the Civil Service Commission, under which the Commissioners informed him they appoint skilled men outside of Civil Service rules. Major Olberg said he would inquire of the Civil Service Commission in regard to this matter, but did not see how this would help matters in this case in view of the limitation placed by the Comptroller General as to the per diem pay.

Mr. Moore called attention to a very desirable clause in the Treasury Annex act on this subject, as follows:

> ---"Section 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby further authorized, without regard to civil-service laws, rules, or regulations, to obtain such special architectural or other expert technical services as he may deem necessary and specially order in writing, and to pay for such services such prices or rates of compensation as he may consider just and reasonable from the appropriation for said building, any statute to the contrary notwithstanding. (Public No.45, 65th Congress, Approved Sept.27,1917).

Major Olberg showed prints illustrating the Coolidge Dam. The Commission were pleased with the design. The Dam has a height of 250 feet and 125 pounds

pressure to the square inch. The Commission advised that the architecture be reduced to a minimum. Attention was called to the Dam at White Plains, New York, designed by York and Sawyer.

Major Olberg felt that possibly a contract could be made with a good firm of architects to do the necessary work on the Coolidge Dam, and that he would take up this question with the Comptroller General.

12. PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION BILL: In accordance with the request of Senator Fernald, the Commission considered Bill S.661, introduced by Senator King, which proposes to amend the organic act of the National Capital Park Commission. The Commission noted that the Bill is similar to Bill H.R.8830, adopted by the House of Representatives on February 8, 1926.

Mr. Moore said he personally appeared before the House Committee on the District of Columbia, at their request, and in general spoke against the House bill, since he felt there was enough machinery in the District of Columbia and that there were enough plans and projects under way. It was important he thought rather that the right spirit get behind these plans and have the officials of the District carry them out in the spirit in which they were designed. Mr. Moore advised that the Bill as passed by the House of Representatives adds to the seven members of the original National Capital Park Commission four additional members "well qualified and experienced in city planning, one of whom shall be a bona fide resident of the District of Columbia".

Mr. Delano said it is now proposed to change H.R.8830 in the Senate and insert in it the following amendment:

> "and six members of distinguished experience in city planning, four of whom shall represent different technical elements of city planning, one of whom shall be a bona fide resident of the District of Columbia, and one of whom shall be appointed from the country at large, all to be appointed for---".

Each of these bills proposes to abolish the present Highway Commission, it being generally believed that the persons at fault primarily for cutting down street grades and wooded areas in the District of Columbia, are in addition to real estate speculators, those in the office of the Computing Engineer and in the District Surveyor's office, under the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

The secretary called attention to the fact that Bills S.661 and H.R.8830 amend only section 1 of the Organic Act, while section 2 of the Organic Act provides that "In the selection of lands to be acquired the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts shall be requested".

The Commission thought they were not inclined to oppose either of the proposed bills, as the restudy of the District Highway System and the preservation of natural scenery is of vital importance; but that in the development of the National Capital, the L'Enfant Plan and the Plan of 1901 must always be considered at the basis of further development of the city. Mr. Medary said the American Institute of Architects at its Convention in Washington this spring proposes to urge the completion of these plans by the time of the Bicentennial of the Birthday of George Washington in 1932. The Commission submitted a report to Senator Fernald (Exhibit I).

13. NEW MEDICAL BUILDING, HOWARD UNIVERSITY: Dr. Emmett J. Scott, Secretary-Treasurer of Howard University, submitted plans for a new Medical Building.

The Commission inspected the plans and discussed them with the architect of Howard University, Mr. Albert I. Cassell. The Commission approved the plans with the recommendation that the main entrance be lowered, that the edges of the roof be straightened, and that the lobby be simplified. (Exhibit J).

14. NATIONAL CONSERVATORY OF MUSIC: Hon. P. P. Elliott, Chairman of the

House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, submitted to the Commission for a report Bill H.R.7755, "To designate a building site for the National Conservatory of Music of America, and for other purposes.". Action in the matter was deferred until the next meeting.

15. ERICSSON MEMORIAL: Mr. Fraser having advised, on February 6, 1926, that "the complete full size group for the Ericsson Monument is finished", several of the members of the Commission inspected the model in the studio of Mr. Fraser, in New York City. The Commission approved the model. (Exhibit K).

16. MEADE MEMORIAL: Under date of February 17, 1926, Major U.S. Grant 3d, Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks, submitted the following letter, with plans for the Meade Memorial:

> "Referring to recent correspondence relative to the benches for the Meade Memorial, I am enclosing herewith duplicate copies of sheet #3 of the architects' drawings, showing the design of these benches as revised to meet the Commission's wishes. The architects advise that they desire to construct the benches of Milford pink granite, instead of pink Tennessee marble as previously stated. Will you please inform me as to whether the revised design and the material are satisfactory to the Commission?
>
> "There are also enclosed duplicate copies of sheets P-1, P-2, P-3 and P-4, showing various arrangements of the bronze lettering on the tablet. The architects would appreciate either a selection of one of these arrangements by the Commission of Fine Arts, or their suggestions for re-submission."

The Commission noted that the design of the benches for the Meade Memorial was in accordance with that adopted as the type of bench for the Mall. The Commission approved the use of Milford pink granite, instead of pink Tennessee marble, as requested by the architects heretofore.

The arrangement of the bronze lettering on the tablet, as proposed, did not meet with the approval of the Commission. The sketches were referred to Mr. Medary with request that he take up this matter directly with the architects."

17. LANDSCAPE PLAN, BUREAU OF STANDARDS: The secretary stated that under date of January 14, 1926, he received the following letter from Dr. George K.

Burgess, Director of the Bureau of Standards, with reference to the development of their grounds:

> "May I express through you my appreciation of the recent visit of your Commission to the National Bureau of Standards and of the interest which its members have been good enough to take in our problem of the program of future development of the buildings and grounds.
>
> It is a pleasure to have the cooperation of your group with their broad vision and artistic judgment. It is my desire to see the development unified, and creditably treated from the viewpoints of landscape gardening, good architectural effect, and sound engineering consistent with the primary purpose of the institution. This development, I feel sure, need not sacrifice artistic treatment, which its natural attractiveness deserves. The hilltop and hillsides, indeed, offer unusual possibilities for artistic skill and ingenuity in bringing out fully the natural features of the site.
>
> May I ask the opinion of your members as to the best method of securing outline sketches of alternative treatments suitable for study and elaboration in collaboration with the Bureau administration, to secure a maximum adaptability for the Bureau's scientific work and of artistic dignity, not too severe, in the ensemble. It has occurred to me that it may not be inconsistent with your practice to designate a subcommittee with which I might confer on the general subject. Our final conclusions might then be reported to the main body."

The matter was referred to Mr. Greenleaf, who advised that the Bureau of Standards should secure a competent landscape architect to prepare a plan for them, after which the Commission could advise further in this matter. Mr. Greenleaf recommended Mr. Bremer W. Pond, of Boston, Mr. Charles Downing Lay, and Mr. Charles N. Lowrie, of New York City, any one of whom could prepare a good landscape design for the Bureau of Standards. Dr. Burgess was informed accordingly (Exhibit L).

18. NEW CONSERVATORY, BOTANIC GARDEN: A conference was held in the evening with Mr. Robert Luce, Chairman of the Committee on the Library, House of Representatives, as to a site for the proposed new conservatory. Square No.576, adjoining the Capitol Grounds, at Maryland Avenue and First Street, N.E., was agreed upon as the site for the construction of the large glass house, but it

is not to be of great height. Mr. Moore suggested that Mr. Jens B. Jensons, architect of Chicago, who recently laid out the Capitol Grounds at San Juan, Porto Rico, be consulted, and that he should consider in connection with this matter the general subject of the enlargement of the Capitol Grounds and the location of the new House Office Annex. Mr. Lace agreed to make available to Major Grant the $5,000 appropriated for this study.

The Commission had as their guests at luncheon Mr. Frank B. Noyes, President of the Associated Press, and Mrs. Noyes; also Hon. Stephen T. Mather, Director of the National Park Service.

COPY

February 3, 1926.

Dear Sir:

On January 29, 1926, the Personnel Classification Board changed the allocation of Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and Executive Officer of the Commission of Fine Arts, from C.A.F.7-2 to C.A.F. 8-2. The allocation provides for an increase in salary from $2400 to $2700 a year. The Commission of Fine Arts desires that the incumbent receive a salary of at least $3,000 a year, and in accordance with the provisions of the Classification Act the Commission hereby respectfully requests that his compensation be $3,000 a year, effective February 1, 1926. A supplemental appropriation of $250 for the remainder of the fiscal year 1926 will be required, and the Commission asks that you please allow this amount.

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

The Director,

Bureau of the Budget.

EXHIBIT A.

COPY

February 20, 1926.

Sir:

In accordance with your request of January 22nd, the Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on February 18, 1926, gave consideration to Bill, H. R. 8122, "To provide for the erection of a National Guard Armory, in the District of Columbia, as a memorial ~~xxx~~ to those who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during times of war". The Commission respectfully report as follows:

The Commission have known of the efforts made in past years to erect an Armory for the District of Columbia Militia. No city in the country deserves more adequate accommodations for its militia than does the City of Washington. Here the service performed by the militia should find recognition from Congress. If the Pension Office building can be made available for the use of the District Militia, it will meet an immediate need for an Armory. The plan of the building lends itself to the uses of troops. Moreover, it was built as a memorial to the soldiers of the Civil War.

The matter was taken up with Major General Anton Stephan, Commanding the District of Columbia Militia, who expresses himself heartily in favor of the suggestion. A copy of his letter on the subject is enclosed.

The memorial feature proposed by the Bill, however, is believed to be covered by the Act approved June 7, 1924 (Public Resolution No.28, 68th Congress), providing for"a memorial to those members of the military and naval forces of the United States from the District of Columbia who served their country in the Great War". The project of a monumental bandstand in Potomac Park has been approved by Congress as a memorial. The design of the bandstand has been approved by the Commission.

The Commission of Fine Arts therefore recommend that, instead of constructing an Armory building, as proposed by H.R.8122, the Pension Office building be turned over to the District of Columbia Militia and adapted to such uses. The site heretofore considered for an Armory, along Pennsylvania Avenue, between Twelfth and Thirteenth Streets, may well be used for the Internal Revenue Building or the General Accounting Office, or other of the needed Government buildings.

For the Commission:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Hon. R. W. Elliott, Chairman,
Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit B.

EXHIBIT B.

EXHIBIT B.

HEADQUARTERS
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MILITIA
NATIONAL GUARD ARMORY
472 L STREET NORTHWEST
WASHINGTON

RECEIVED
THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
WASHINGTON, D. C.
FEB 11 1926
NOTED

February 10, 1926

Mr. H. P. Caemmerer,
Secretary and Executive Officer,
The Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. Caemmerer:

Replying to your letter of February 8, I have to inform you that the National Guard of the District of Columbia has pending before the Public Buildings Commission a request for assignment of space in the Pension Office Building. The use of the Pension Office Building for armory purposes is highly desirable, in view of its downtown location and the fact that the large rotunda would be available for drill purposes. If the National Guard could secure sufficient space in the Pension Office Building (twenty-five thousand square feet, exclusive of the rotunda) for company assembly and locker rooms, it would be possible to secure storage and other facilities outside of the Pension Office Building to meet the balance of our requirements.

It is probable that a suitable armory building could not be erected for less than two million dollars, and the greater part of this sum would be saved to the Federal and District Governments by the use of the Pension Office Building for armory purposes, as it is believed that the Pension Office will be of no use to the Federal Government upon completion of the pending building program, which will care for all needs of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia. The Pension Building was originally erected, it is understood, as a memorial to veterans of the Civil War, and its use as an armory would be in keeping with the traditions which have grown up around the building. The use of the rotunda for drill purposes would in no way interfere with its use for convention or other purposes of like character desired by the Federal Government, inasmuch as the National Guard activities are confined to the evening period. As the War Department authorizes the organization of additional troops allocated to the District of Columbia the use of additional space will of course become necessary, but it is not believed that this increase will be rapid nor that it would interfere with the occupancy of the building by other departments, inasmuch as the increase could probably be cared for as offices were shifted to other buildings in the ordinary business of those departments.

The proposed armory authorized in H. R. Bill 8122 should be erected for the National Guard of the District of Columbia provided other adequate facilities can not be permanently turned over to the organization. Our present armory at 472 L Street, Northwest, is undesirably located as affects morale, is inadequate for drill purposes and other necessary instruction, and at most can only be considered as a shelter for the organization. We are under notice to

vacate this building on June 30, of this year, as the Stilson Hutchins Estate, which owns the building, is in process of settlement and the Trustees desire the building vacated for sale. The plan for the proposed armory was approved by the Commission of Fine Arts prior to the submission of the plan to Congress by the Armory Commission on April 13, 1910, H. R. Document No. 860, Sixty-first Congress, second session. The cost of the proposed armory is no doubt slightly larger than has been ordinarily expended by the various States for an individual armory. However, it is understood that the Commission of Fine Arts, at the time of its approval of the plan, decided that the building must be in keeping with other Governmental structures in the City of Washington, and therefore should be more elaborate than would ordinarily be the case. However, the National Guard will be satisfied with whatever type of building Congress deems it advisable to erect. At present we have ten company or similar units, with a strength of 40 officers and 600 enlisted men actually in the service, to be housed. In addition, the following will have to be provided for: offices for the Regular Army Instructors on duty with the organization, headquarters offices, general property storerooms, shooting gallery, class rooms, etc.

The National Guard of the District of Columbia is allotted 33 additional company or similar units with a strength of 84 officers and 2,022 enlisted men yet to be organized. These units form parts of higher tactical units organized under the provisions of the National Defense Act, and it is contemplated that it will be necessary to organize all of these units by approximately 1930. This expansion will have to be cared for and can not be cared for in any rented quarters which can be secured in Washington.

I enclose herewith a memorandum relating to the armory situation which gives further information concerning this matter.

Very respectfully yours,

Anton Stephan

Anton Stephan,
Major General
Commanding.

[PUBLIC RESOLUTION—No. 28—68TH CONGRESS.]

[S. J. Res. 73.]

Joint Resolution Providing for the appointment of a commission for the purpose of erecting in Potomac Park, in the District of Columbia, a memorial to those members of the armed forces of the United States from the District of Columbia who served in the Great War.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That a commission to be composed of Charles A. Baker, Edward F. Colladay, John Joy Edson, Mrs. William Corcoran Eustis, Isaac Gans, E. Lester Jones, Arthur D. Marks, Frank B. Noyes, Anton Stephan, J. R. McDonald, Gist Blair, and any other person who with the approval of a majority of the commission is added thereto or substituted for any member thereof, is hereby created to be known as the District of Columbia Memorial Commission for the purpose of erecting in Potomac Park in the District of Columbia a memorial to those members of the military and naval forces of the United States from the District of Columbia who served their country in the Great War. Such memorial shall be of artistic design suitable for military music and shall take the place of the present wooden band stand in Potomac Park.

SEC. 2. That the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army is hereby authorized and directed to select the site for the memorial and to grant permission for the erection of said memorial thereon: *Provided*, That the site, design, and plans for the memorial shall have been approved by the Joint Committee on the Library acting with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts: *Provided further*, That the memorial shall be erected under the supervision of the said Chief of Engineers and that no part of the cost of erection shall be borne by the United States.

Approved, June 7, 1924.

COPY

February 24, 1926.

Dear Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on February 18, 1926, considered the enclosed design submitted through you by one of your constituents as a monument for soldiers in cemeteries of the United States. The design did not commend itself as being suitable for such monuments and it was therefore disapproved. A memorial tablet is more appropriate for the purpose intended.

The Commission would call your attention to the enclosed report for the year 1918, in which the subject of monuments for the Arlington National Cemetery received special attention. The general subject of the development of the Arlington National Cemetery is treated in the Ninth Report of the Commission of Fine Arts, pages 115-120, a copy of which is also being sent to you.

The erection of monuments in the Arlington National Cemetery is now controlled by regulations of the War Department, issued August 5, 1916, which were prepared with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts. A copy of these regulations is enclosed.

Arlington National Cemetery was taken as a type for the development of the permanent American Cemeteries in Europe, the plans for which were prepared by this Commission. Three elements, which give dignity and beauty to Arlington, were emphasized,-the small headstones, the green grass, and the trees overhead. Arlington may thus be taken as a type also for military cemeteries in other parts of the United States, or such other cemeteries where our soldiers are buried.

For the Commission:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

EXHIBIT C.

Hon. Frank R. Reid,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

COPY

February 24, 1926.

Dear Major O'Conner:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on February 18, 1926, heartily approved the tentative plans submitted by you for the development of the waterfront of the Washington Channel along Water Street. The Commission approve Plan B in general. In its Tenth Report the Commission proposes to discuss the treatment of Water Street in connection with the Park and Boulevard System of the city and to recommend to the attention of Congress appropriations to carry out plans along the general lines laid down on your sketches.

The Commission again appreciates the opportunity afforded by you for a full discussion of this important project.

Sincerely yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Major James A. O'Conner,

District Engineer Officer in charge of Washington work,

Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT D.

COPY

February 20, 1926.

Dear General Cheatham:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on February 18, 1926, inspected the plans submitted by you and Surgeon General Ireland, for additional buildings at the Army Medical Center of Washington.

The Commission approve the plans, with the suggestion that the eliptical arches be restudied.

The plans are herewith returned.

Sincerely yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Major General B. F. Cheatham,
The Quartermaster General,
War Department,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT E.

COPY

February 24, 1926.

Dear Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on February 18, 1926, witnessed the uniform flag display which took place during the afternoon of that day on F Street, between Twelfth and Thirteenth Streets. There had been erected 15 flagstaffs, 25 feet apart, on each side of the street, each having a flag 3 x 5 feet in size.

The Commission approve in principle the plan proposed by the American Legion for a uniform display of the flag on the leading streets of Washington, on national holidays and other patriotic occasions.

The flagstaff should be lengthened and stiffened. The flagstaffs exhibited on F Street are entirely too weak. This was apparent even on a windless day. At its present height of staff the flag will interfere with traffic along the curb of the street. The flag should be somewhat larger. With these changes the object of a significant, dignified and effective street decoration will result.

For the Commission:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. Norman B. Landreau, Chairman,
Joint Committee American Legion
and Veterans of Foreign Wars,
Investment Building,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT F.

N. C. R. 90

In reply, address not the signer of this letter but Bureau of Construction and Repair, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

NAVY DEPARTMENT

BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Refer to No. JJ5-(5) (ME) N/C

S1

RECEIVED
THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
WASHINGTON, D. C.
1926
NOTED
FEB 6 - 1926

Subject: Standardization of the National Ensign.

Gentlemen:

Receipt of your letter of December 22, 1925, requesting information as to the number and sizes of flags (based on the modular standard of measurement, adopted by the Commission of Fine Arts) which should be included in the proposed Executive Order pertaining to the U. S. Flag, is acknowledged.

At the present time the U.S.Ensign used by the Navy consists of ten sizes, ranging from 15' x 36.1' to 1.31' x 2.489'. The dimensions of nine of the flags conform to the standard proportions prescribed by Executive Order of May 29, 1916, No. 2390, which is now in force. The dimensions of the tenth flag are 5.15' x 6.30'. This flag is used for parade purposes, its non-conformity with standard proportions being permitted by Exception (a) of the Executive Order referred to above.

It is the Bureau's understanding that the purpose of the proposed standardization of the National flag is to limit the number of sizes of flags to the minimum required for Government and private use; and to harmonize the proportions and colors of its constituent parts to the extent permitted by commercial practices and economical manufacture. Previous correspondence on the proposed standardization indicates that the modular standard of measurement referred to in your letter as having been adopted by the Commission as the one which most satisfactorily meets requirements is as follows:

Size of Flag--as 13 is to 21, in which 13 is the hoist and 21 is the fly..
Size of Union--as 7 is to 9, in which 7 is the hoist and 9 is the fly.
Size of Star Circle - Diameter three-fourths the width of the stripe.

Thorough investigation of the Navy's future requirements indicates that two sizes of ensigns at present being used, may be eliminated. Taking into consideration this fact, the Navy will require, under the adopted modular standard of measurement, ensigns in eight sizes as follows:

Width of Hoist - Nineteen (19) feet.
Fifteen (15) feet.
Twelve (12) feet.
Nine (9) feet.
Six (6) feet.
Three (3) feet.
One (1) foot.
A flag for parade purposes.

A letter dated December 21, 1923 from the Division of Simplified Practice, Bureau of Commerce, addressed to the Bureau, recommended the number and sizes of flags to be adopted as standard by the Commission of Fine Arts. The hoist dimensions of the flags listed above, with the exception of the parade flag, conform with those recommended in the letter referred to, it being understood that such dimensions are multiples of the width of stripes, which can be most economically furnished from the standard widths of bunting as at present produced by manufacturing concerns. It will be noted that while the hoists of the flags listed above are in even feet, the length of the fly under the adopted modular standard will not be in even feet. If it is considered desirable that both the fly and the hoist of the flags, which are finally adopted, should be in even feet, the Bureau has no objection to slight deviations in the length of the fly.

The parade flag referred to above is essential for Navy use. It should be approximately 5'x6'. Any slight departure from these dimensions, in order to make the size conform with the size of the parade flag used by the U.S. Army, will be satisfactory to the Bureau. If it is considered undesirable to include in the adopted sizes, a flag with proportions which do not conform to the modular standard of 13:21, it is recommended that the proposed Executive Order include a clause similar to that in the existing order, which permits the colors carried by troops and camp colors to be of the sizes

prescribed for the military service (Army and Navy).

It is understood that when the proposed draft of the order pertaining to the United States Flag is prepared, the Bureau will be given an opportunity for further comment.

Respectfully,

J.D. Sear[illegible]

R[illegible], Chief Constructor of the Navy

The Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT G

COPY

February 24, 1926.

Dear Mr. Earley:

Your letter of February 16th and the sketch which you submitted for a tablet to Lieutenant Colonel Gaillard, to be erected at the Gaillard Cut, in the Panama Canal Zone, received the attention of the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on February 18, 1926.

The Commission recommend a change in the design, as suggested in the attached drawing. It is drawn according to scale and provides for a tablet 20 feet in length and 14½ feet at its greatxest width. The Commission advise that the tablet should stand vertically, so as best to be seen from the ships passing through the Canal. The Commission concur in the use of aggregate B for the background and in aggregate C for the lettering and the device, as suggested by you.

For the Commission:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. John J. Earley,
Architectural Sculptor,
2131 G Street, N.W.,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT H.

COPY

February 19, 1926.

Dear Senator Fernald:

The Commission of Fine Arts, to whom was referred the bill (S.661), Amending the Act entitled "An Act providing for a comprehensive development of the park and playground system of the National Capital," approved June 6, 1924, respectfully report:

On February 8, 1926, the House of Representatives passed an Act (H.R.8830) with the same title as S.661, and designed to accomplish the same purpose.

This Commission favors the principle embodied in both of these bills in that both provide for the development of a comprehensive plan for the District of Columbia, supplementing the plans of 1792 and 1901. The Commission particularly favors such a restudy of the present highway plan as shall adapt that plan to the topography of the District of Columbia. It also favors a correlation of the plans of the District of Columbia with the plans of adjacent portions of Maryland and Virginia.

Very respectfully, yours,

H. P. Caemmerer,

Secretary and Executive Officer.

Hon. Bert M. Fernald, Chairman,
Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds,
United States Senate,

EXHIBIT I.

COPY

February 20, 1926.

Dear Mr. Scott:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on February 18,1926, approved the plans submitted by you for the new Medical School Building of Howard University, with the following suggestions, which were explained to your architect:

1. Bring down the central motive of the facade;

2. Straighten the ends of the roof;

3. Simplify the lobby.

The plans are herewith returned.

Very respectfully, yours,

H. P. Caemerer,

Secretary and Executive Officer.

Dr. Emmett J. Scott,
Secretary-Treasurer,
Howard University,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT J.

February 19, 1926.

Dear Mr. Fraser:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on February 18, 1926, approved the full size group for the Ericsson Memorial.

Sincerely yours,

H. R. Caemmerer,

Secretary and Executive Officer.

Mr. James E. Fraser,

328 East 42d Street,

New York, N. Y.

EXHIBIT K.

COPY

March 3, 1926.

Dear Dr. Burgess:

Your letter of January 14th, with reference to securing an appropriate design for the treatment of the grounds of the Bureau of Standards, received the attention of the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on February 18, 1926.

The Commission recommend that this matter be taken up by the Bureau of Standards with one of the following Landscape Architects:

Mr. Bremer W. Pond,
18 Tremont Street, Boston, Mass.

Mr. Charles Downing Lay, 101 Park Avenue, New York City,

Mr. Charles H. Lowrie, 101 Park Avenue, New York City.

The Commission is much interested in your problem to develop the grounds of the Bureau of Standards, and will be pleased to cooperate with you further. Any one of the landscape architects above mentioned is competent to prepare a good design for you, as they are experienced men in their profession.

Sincerely yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Dr. George K. Burgess, Director,
Bureau of Standards,
Department of Commerce.

EXHIBIT L.